

REMARKS

The specification and claims 12, 15, and 26 have been amended to overcome the 112 rejection as discussed below.

Claim 1 has been amended by including the limitation of allowable claim 6. Claim 3 has been amended to correct sentence structure.

Claims 12-15 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The present amendments to these claims and to corresponding portions of the specification clarify the meaning of the language. The term aromatic is generic to all aromatic compounds, carbocyclic and heterocyclic, and is less confusing. Further, the language now indicates that the Ar group serves to “complete” a ring rather than “form” a ring. The structural examples and the passage at page 5, line 25 make it clear that the Ar groups serve to complete a ring with the indicated nitrogen atom in the ring but that the Ar group itself need not contain a heteroatom.

Claims 1-4, 9-17, and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liu et al., Angew. Chem. Int. Ed (2002), Vol 41, No. 1, pages 182-184. According to the Examiner:

Liu et al. discloses EL devices comprising a mixed emissive layer comprising diamine compound NPB and boron compound (mdppy)BF (see page 183, col. 1, last paragraph and Figure 6). The boron complex reads upon the compounds of claims 9-17. Liu discloses the devices emit white light (see title) per instant claim 31. The mixed NPB: (mdppy)BF layer is disclosed as emitting in the blue region (see Figure 7) per instant claim 3.

The present claim 1 is directed to an electroluminescent device with a cathode, an anode, and a layer between them. While photoluminescence relates to the spectrum obtained when a material is exposed to radiation, electroluminescence relates to the spectrum obtained when the material is exposed to an electric field. It is noted that the reference only reports photoluminescence data (Fig. 7) on the of the mixed component layer arrangement, not electroluminescence data, and the author admits that an OLED device was not made for the mixture. In addition, the reference does not disclose a host/dopant

relationship using the amounts of dopant shown in claim 6, now incorporated in the main claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Kluegel', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.